

The Government will make award to the responsible offeror whose offer conforms to the solicitation and is most advantageous to the Government cost or other factors considered. For this solicitation, all evaluation factors other than cost or price when combined are significantly more important than cost or price.

Evaluation factors and significant subfactors to determine quality of product or service:

<b>I.</b>	<b>Technical Evaluation of SOW</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>II.</b>	<b>Experience</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>III.</b>	<b>Past Performance</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>IV.</b>	<b>Service and Support</b>	<b>20</b>
	<b>100</b>	<b>Total Points</b>

**I. Technical Evaluation of the SOW (30)**

i. Technical and innovative approach to the SOW (15)

Proposals will be evaluated on adherence to the SOW and on the novelty of the approach proposed. Particular attention should be paid to the uniqueness of this requirement - i.e. the vast amount of equipment and material located in different areas of the country. Proposals should show how the system fits into EPA/CID's particular situation.

ii. Delivery schedule and milestones (15)

Proposals should demonstrate a quick delivery and installation of this system in both locations requiring it. Inherent in this should be an aggressive training and set-up plan, as it is expected that this system will be in use immediately.

**II. Experience (35)**

Proposals will be evaluated on the extent to which they show relevant performance and likelihood of success in meeting the government's requirements as identified in the Statement of Work. Demonstration of successful performance and familiarity with the bar coding system and the associated software, and experience, as demonstrated by current projects and those completed within the past two years involving services of similar type, scope, and complexity. Offerors must submit documentation of at least one successful project for this evaluation factor.

**III. Past Performance (15)**

Proposals will be evaluated on:

The extent to which the proposal establishes relevant corporate experience, as demonstrated by successful performance on current projects and those completed within the past two (2) years. These should include successful experiences in managing projects of comparable scope and complexity. Provide experience with other Government agencies if available. Timely and acceptable completion of comparable projects. Completions within budget of comparable projects. The references will be contacted to report on their experiences with the contractor.

The Offerors must submit three (3) references, to include a valid point of contact and current phone number, that may be contacted regarding past performance.

Include the following information for each contract and subcontract listed:

- (a) Name of contracting activity.
- (b) Contract number.
- (c) Contract title.
- (d) Contract type
- (e) Brief description of contract or subcontract and relevance to this requirement.
- (f) Total contract value.
- (g) Period of performance.
- (h) Contracting officer, telephone number, and e-mail address.
- (i) Program manager/project officer, telephone number, and e-mail address.
- (j) Administrative Contracting officer, if different from (h) above, telephone number and e-mail address.
- (k) List of subcontractors (if applicable).
- (l) Compliance with subcontracting plan goals for small disadvantaged business concerns, monetary targets for small disadvantaged business participation, and the notifications submitted under FAR 19.1202-4 (b), if applicable.

#### **IV. Service and Support (20)**

Proposals will be evaluated on the extent to which they demonstrate adequacy of post award service and support. This system, as outlined in the statement of work, will require hands-on training and support to become fully operational. The plan for providing this service and support will be evaluated as well as the personnel that are proposed to provide the service. The offerors should provide resumes of the individuals slated to provide the initial support and their relevant experience with similar inventory support systems.

#### **SCORING PLAN**

The evaluation of technical proposals shall be accomplished using the Scoring Plan specified below.

The values used in the technical evaluation shall be limited to those established in the Scoring Plan provided below.

<u>Value</u>	<u>Descriptive Statement</u>
0	The element is not addressed, or is totally deficient and without merit.
1	The element is addressed but contains deficiencies that can be corrected only by major or significant changes to relevant portions of the proposal.
2	Clarification is required. Final scoring of the element will be made following limited discussions or full negotiations if discussions or negotiations are held with the offeror.
3	The proposal element is adequate. Overall meets specifications. However, comments should be made on any perceived weaknesses or on areas in which an offeror could improve.
4	The proposal is good with some superior features.
5	The proposal is superior in most features.

Intermediate values such as 2.5, 3.5, or 4.5 are not defined and therefore shall not be used to score the proposals. The numeric values (1-5) shall be converted into percentages of the total available points for that value. For instance, if a score of 4 (80%) is assigned to a sub-criteria that accounts for 10% of the total technical evaluation criteria weight, the following calculation produces the total score for that sub-criteria. Thus, the value score percentage of 80% (4) is multiplied by the sub-criteria weight of 10 to produce a sub-criteria total of 8.

Value Key:

5	=	100%
4	=	80%
3	=	60%
2	=	40%
1	=	20%
0	=	0%

